



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

PAF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,821	03/09/2004	Daniel J. Smith	25669-020	6049
7590	02/17/2006			
Ingrid A. Beattie, Ph.D. Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C. One Financial Center Boston, MA 02111			EXAMINER SWARTZ, RODNEY P	
			ART UNIT 1645	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/797,821	SMITH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D.	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)        Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/05</u>.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)        Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol>
---	---

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicants' Response to Restriction Requirement, received 1 December 2005, is acknowledged. Applicants elect, with traverse, Invention I, claims 1-14, drawn to protein, classified in class 424, subclass 185.1.

Applicants' Preliminary Amendment, received 1 December 2005, is acknowledged.

Claims 15-22 have been canceled. Claim 5 has been amended.

2. Claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration.

### **Specification**

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 1, line 8, the status of application 09/290,049 needs to be updated,

Page 23, line 33, what is meant by "known to in the art"?

Appropriate correction is required.

### **Drawings**

4. The drawings submitted 9 March 2004 have been declared informal.

### **Double Patenting**

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

Art Unit: 1645

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 5-25 of copending Application No. 10/383,930 in view of Gombotz et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,019,400).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: 1) both sets of claims are drawn to immunogenic compositions comprising the same amino acid sequence peptides and structures, and 2) claims 1-14 of the instant application 10/797,821 also comprise a biocompatible microparticle. The microparticles of the instant application 10/797,821 are not required to be attached to or made part of the peptides, but simply present in the composition. Both sets of claims recite "a composition comprising". The open language encompasses any constituents in addition to the recited amino acid sequence peptide structures.

Gombotz et al teach the production of microparticles incorporating any peptides for the purpose of controlled release of the peptides to increase the immunogenicity of the peptides.

The claims of the instant application 10/797,821 do not require that the microparticle be attached to or made part of the peptides, but simply be present in the composition. Thus, in view of Gombotz et al who teach microparticles to be added to immunogenic compositions of peptides or which incorporate the peptides, the claims of the instant application 10/797,821 do not patentably distinguish these instant claims from the instant claims because the claims fall under obviousness-type double patenting.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-10 are indefinite concerning the identity of the sequence being claimed.

Claims 8 and 10 are drawn to a polypeptide or domain which comprises "an" amino acid sequence "of" SEQ ID NO:X. It is unclear if the claims are drawn to the whole amino acid sequence X or a subsequence thereof. If the claims are to be drawn to the whole sequence X, then the recommended language should be "comprises an amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO's: w, y, z."

Claims 7 and 9 are drawn to a polypeptide which comprises "a" catalytic domain or "a" glucan binding domain "of" SEQ ID NO:X. It is unclear if the claims are drawn to the whole amino acid sequence X or a subsequence thereof. If the claims are to be drawn to the whole sequence X, then the recommended language should be "comprises a catalytic domain selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO's: w, y, z." or "comprises a glucan binding domain selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO's: w, y, z."

### **Conclusion**

9. No claims are allowed.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D., Art Unit 1645, whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 1645

272-0865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette F. Smith, can be reached on (571)272-0864.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Rodney P. Swartz*  
RODNEY P. SWARTZ, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art Unit 1645

February 18, 2006